

was \$75,306 per year. In 1983, 1984 and 1985 it was \$50,052 per year. And for this year we appropriated \$49,051. That is clearly not an increase in state support for law enforcement. It is, in fact, declining. The statement in the resolution is false. I ask that you strike these three WHEREASES. They are patently not true and they imply, they imply the retrocession will save money. With that, I take issue. Most states who are not under Public Law 280 and have parallel jurisdiction similar to what is proposed here are or have been embroiled in litigation with Indian tribes over jurisdiction. Several key cases in the last year have gone clear to the Supreme Court. As you may be fully aware, you may not, the hot issue right now in states like Florida, Washington, Arizona, is Indian gambling. Such litigation in federal courts is not cheap and it would be foolhardy to assume that Nebraska will be immune. Predicting these costs would be impossible. But let me say that I don't believe retrocession will save this state one dime. The second through the fourth WHEREASES are false and misleading. I ask you to accept my amendment and strike them from the resolution. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Marsh.

SENATOR MARSH: Thank you, Mr. President. It was my understanding when the Appropriations Committee was lobbied for the need for having any state dollars available for law enforcement in the county under discussion was that county costs were increasing and, therefore, the state needed to subsidize because of the increased cost. For all these years, have we been under false consideration? We certainly had a sizable delegation who asked for that state support. The Appropriations Committee reduced their figure this year assuming that retrocession was going to be adopted, therefore, there would be less need for it. We have been in a financial crunch, but if you take the date, not the figure which...not the date which Senator Goll used but the original year which is in the resolution, it is, in fact, a true statement.

PRESIDENT: Is there further discussion? Senator Vard Johnson.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, the issue before us this morning and this afternoon will be whether or not the State of Nebraska and